## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-29 and 36-38 are pending in this application.

Claims 26, 29, 36 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice by the present Amendment, and claims 1, 15 and 38 have been amended by the present Amendment.

Amended claims 1, 15 and 38 do not introduce any new subject matter.

## **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-29 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0226148 ("Ferguson") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0149708 ("Nagata"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,724,317 ("Kitano").

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of Nagata.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the display being mounted on an outside surface of the door, and the media player being mounted on an inside surface of the door opposite the outside surface, wherein the door is pivoted to an open position to provide access to a data media loading point on the media player, and pivoted to a closed position to allow a user to view a video program on the display, as recited in amended claims 1 and 15. Further, the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that the display and controls for controlling functions of the media player are positioned on an outside surface of the door and the media player is positioned on an inside surface of the door opposite the outside surface, wherein, when the door is in the closed position, the display faces a user to

allow the user to view a video program on the display, and the controls are accessible by the user, and wherein, when the door is in the open position, a data media loading point on the media player is accessible by the user, as recited in amended claim 38.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant maintains that amended claims 1, 15 and 38 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reason that claims 2 and 5-14 depend from claim 1, and claims 16-25, 27 and 28 depend from claim 15, claims 2, 5-14, 16-25, 27 and 28 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references, claims 26, 29, 36 and 37 having been canceled.

As such, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-29 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

## **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael F. Morano Reg. No. 44,952

Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 Woodbury Road Woodbury, NY 11797 (516) 692-8888